

THE DAILY JOURNAL.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1888.

WASHINGTON OFFICE—513 Fourteenth St.
P. M. HEAT, Correspondent.NEW YORK OFFICE—104 Temple Court,
Corner Beekman and Nassau streets.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

One year, without Sunday	\$12.00
One year, with Sunday	14.00
Six months, without Sunday	6.00
Six months, with Sunday	7.00
Three months, without Sunday	3.00
Three months, with Sunday	3.50
One month, without Sunday	1.00
One month, with Sunday	1.25

Reduced Rates to Clubs.

Subscribers with any of our numerous agents, or send subscriptions to

THE JOURNAL NEWSPAPER COMPANY,
INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

Can be found at the following places:

LONDON—American Exchange in Europe, 449 Strand.

PARIS—American Exchange in Paris, 35 Boulevard des Capucines.

NEW YORK—Giles House and Windsor Hotel.

PHILADELPHIA—A. P. Kemble, 3735 Lancaster avenue.

CHICAGO—Palmer House.

CINCINNATI—J. P. Hawley & Co., 154 Vine street.

LOUISVILLE—C. T. Deering, northwest corner Third and Jefferson streets.

ST. LOUIS—Union News Company, Union Depot and Southern Hotel.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Riggs House and Ebbitt House.

Telephone Calls.

Business Office.....238 Editorial Rooms.....242

It may now be safely said that the campaign is open.

SENATOR SHERMAN backed up General Harrison's deliverance on trusts.

The letter is plain language from truthful Ben, and needs no interpretation.

MR. CLEVELAND in his letter clearly indicates his idea that tobacco should continue to be taxed.

GOVERNOR HILL was renominated by the Democrats at Buffalo by acclamation. What will the mugwumps do now, poor things!

DEMOCRATIC papers announce that "Judge Thurman is back home in excellent health and spirits." Has better spirits in Ohio than he got in New York, eh?

WHAT might be called "Hoar's Shorter Catechism" is likely to prove a political standard, if not a classic. Read it in the report of the debate in the Senate yesterday.

THE New York Post is getting ready to support Warner Miller for Governor. The Post is for Cleveland, but even its mugwump stomach cannot stand two of this kind, and hence revolts at Hill.

THE Journal desires to give its opinion that Mr. Cleveland and the Democratic party would both be stronger if they had the courage of their convictions. The people scent out a trimmer unerringly.

WARNER MILLER has struck the whiskey ring of New York right between the eyes. We believe Mr. Miller has done both a brave and politic thing in making an attack upon the arrogant and law-defying liquor combination.

If an epidemic should break out in the crowded quarters of the dirty dagoes, probably the citizens of Indianapolis would not rest so quietly as they do under the wholesale and illegal importation of this gang labor into their midst.

FROM the fact that Mr. Bynum continues to act on the defensive, making a very poor defense at that, we conclude he is not "riled" yet. We have his authority that he is never at his best in a campaign till he gets "riled." He should become so as soon as possible.

THE News says of General Harrison's letter of acceptance: "It is an able letter. Let any one agree or disagree with it as he likes, it is an able letter, and it is another added to the long line of illustrations that General Harrison has made no mistake in his utterances."

To judge from the comments of the Democratic press on General Harrison's letter, it might be thought that the editors were looking for a sort of Fourth-of-July oration. They have become so accustomed to political pyrotechnics from their own party leaders that they do not recognize a statesmanlike document when they see one.

If Mr. Bynum will furnish the name of the Indianapolis workingman he told about at Atlanta, who stayed at home and took care of the babies while his wife went out and made a living at the wash-tub, we will have him hunted up and interviewed. A statement from somebody corroborating some of Mr. Bynum's "inaccuracies" would help him out amazingly. Give us the man's name, Mr. Bynum.

THE mugwumps who supported Cleveland four years ago because of their professed belief in civil-service reform are convicted of dishonesty and hypocrisy in advocating his election this year, in the face of his record and the utterances of General Harrison on the subject. It will be simply useless for Curtis and Godkin, and the rest, to pose before the country as friends of this or any reform after thus exposing their insincerity.

THE Hon. Wm. M. Springer is not one of the Democratic idiots, like the Indianapolis Sentinel, which is trying to make a Democratic victory out of the result in Maine. Mr. Springer was one of the army of Democratic speakers sent into the State by Mr. Brice to help reduce the Republican vote. He sadly says now: "I have got enough of Maine to last me a life time," and the Courier-Journal, which prints Mr. Springer's words, plausibly adds: "So say all of us."

THE Democratic criticisms upon General Harrison's letter are in the main complimentary to the man and the letter. They find it quiet and unsensational. That is the fact. General Harrison is a perfectly self-poised man. He is not pyrotechnic in any degree. If he becomes President the people

of the country can go to bed every night without either alarm or wonderment as to what he will do next. He is a sound, safe, able, conservative man, with a will and an opinion of his own, but with both subordinated to a thoroughly disciplined mind and a kindly tempered disposition. The letter was the expression of the General's character, and as such has struck the level common sense of the country.

IS IT FREE TRADE?

The incisive and conclusive presentation of the issue of protection versus free trade, in General Harrison's letter of acceptance, has started the whole Democratic chorus to yelping. Tray, Blanche and Sweetheart, every cur of high and low degree alike, is repeating, parrot-like, the assertion of Grover Cleveland that the Democratic party does not mean free trade.

The people some of the time, some of the people all the time. The Democratic party will not be able to do what Mr. Lincoln declared to be an impossibility. The Democratic party is for free trade, always has been for free trade, and is for free trade now, despite these shrieking protests. They meant free trade in the Cleveland message of last December, and in the Mills bill, and they mean free trade in the Cleveland letter of acceptance. We propose to submit some evidence on this question, reproducing a good deal which the Journal once before collated, in answer to an assertion made by Hon. Wm. H. English, in his speech at the Tomlinson Hall ratification meeting, in this city, in July last:

The Democratic national convention of 1856, in Cincinnati, resolved—

"That the time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of progressive free trade throughout the world."

The Democratic national conventions of 1860, held at Baltimore and Charleston, adopted a resolution "declaring our affirmative of the above declaration. Of the historic record of the Democratic party, Mr. Henry Watterson, the author of the St. Louis national platform, said only this year:

"If any man doubts what has been the position of the Democratic party, let him read the official utterances made continuously from 1800 to 1884. This record, begun in 1800 by demanding free commerce with all nations, is followed in 1836 by a pledge of progressive free trade, and closes in 1884 by the declaration that unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation."

"Toward and traitors we have had from the beginning, but the party has on the issue held always to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, which was as much an insistence on man's right to exchange freely as it was a demand for freedom of political action. By this record the Democratic party must stand or fall."

The New York World said, while under the editorial control of Mr. Manton Marble, whom President Cleveland appointed to a trusted and confidential mission almost as soon as he was inaugurated:

"No protectionist can be a Democrat. Our hope is in making the Democracy an out-and-out, thick-and-thin, aggressive, intolerant, free-trade party, subordinating all issues to this and thereby drawing to itself all citizens who have a true appreciation of this grand principle."

Senator McDonald, a leading and honored Democrat, in his speech, in the court-house in this city, only a few days ago, said:

"I am opposed to the so-called protective system upon the ground that it is a violation of the spirit and meaning of the Constitution conferring the taxing power."

"I believe that free trade between nations, as between individuals, is the foundation upon which commerce should rest."

Mr. Cleveland, in his letter of acceptance, speaks of the tariff laws under which the present revenues are collected, as "an utter perversion of the power" of the government, just as he spoke of the tariff system in his December message as "vicious, inequitable and illogical."

Mr. Roger Q. Mills, author of the Mills bill, said in Congress four years ago:

"Wealth, prosperity and power will bless the land that is dedicated to free men, free labor and free trade."

This year Mr. Mills said to a delegation of Philadelphia wool merchants:

"The more confusion the tariff works to business the better I like it, because it will the sooner be done away with. I desire free trade, and I will not help to perfect any law that stands in the way of free trade."

On the 31st of March, 1882, Mr. Henry Watterson said:

"The Democratic party, except in the persons of imbeciles hardly worth mentioning, is for the free trade. It is a free-trade party, or it is nothing."

On the 20th day of March, 1882, Mr. Watterson said:

"The Democrat who is not a free trader should go elsewhere. He should join the Republicans."

The Democratic party will make a free-trade fight in 1888. If it loses, it will make another in 1892. The conflict between free-trade and protection is irrepressible, and must be fought out to the bitter end. We spit upon compromise, and propose neither to ask nor give quarter."

Grover Cleveland said to Attorney-general Cassaday, of Pennsylvania:

"I believe in free trade as I believe in the Protestant religion."

Allen G. Thurman said in his Port Huron speech last month:

"Of all the humbugs by which men were attempted to be deceived, this humbug of the laboring man being benefited by a high protective tariff is the greatest."

Speaker Carlisle said:

"All trade should be as free as possible."

Secretary Fairchild said:

"Add to the free list as many articles as possible. Reduce duties upon every dutiable article to the lowest point possible."

Hon. S. S. Cox said:

"It would be a glorious consummation of this debate could we only have gentlemen on the other side join in this invocation to paper and type and to the hearts of honest men to clear the way for British Cobden free trade."

Senator Reagan said in the Senate, on the 11th of July last:

"There is another term in which we speak of free trade as a free-trade country. They adopt the policy of liberalizing their commerce. Others suggest that a free-trade country is a country where a tariff is levied for revenue only."

If that is what the Senator means by free trade, then I am a free-trader, and I take it that most of the Senators on this side of the Chamber are free-traders of that kind."

Henry George said:

"Mr. Cleveland stands before the country a champion of free trade. Mr. Mills's speech is a manly, vigorous and most effective free-trade speech."

Professor Perry, of Williams College, author of "The Principles of Economy," says:

"Secretary Manning has done for free trade

in the United States, in the past year, more effective work than any other man in the country. Postmaster-general Vilas is an outspoken and undoubted friend of free commerce. President Cleveland will go as fast and as far toward that goal as the people and Congress will permit him."

The Chicago Herald, a recognized Democratic organ, says:

"Protection is wrong in itself. It is unjust to the consumer. There must be a tariff, for revenue, but there must not be protection—that is, the taxation of the many for the few—and the Democratic party is the only organization which can sweep away this monstrous error."

Finally, the Indianapolis Sentinel, on the 29th day of May, 1888, said:

"What is to become of the Democrat who believes in protection? asks the New York Tribune. It isn't a hard conundrum, because the Democrat who believes in protection don't exist. He may call himself a Democrat, or even think himself one, but he isn't."

As to what will become of the man who claims to be a Democrat, and at the same time advocates protection, his destiny is sealed. Unless he reforms he will land in the Republican party, sooner or later, and better sooner than later."

This will undoubtedly answer for proof of the general spirit and purpose of the Democratic party. Now for the President's message, the Mills bill and Mr. Cleveland's letter of acceptance:

Of the December message, Hon. Frank Hurd, the distinguished Democrat, said:

"I shall never be able to describe the joy with which I read that message. All I felt was that the issue of free trade is now decisively brought before the American people, and that its cause was more than half won."

Henry George said in February last:

"I look upon the President's message as a free-trade document."

Hon. George G. Vest, Senator from the State of Missouri, in a letter to a club named in his honor, written under date of June 25, last, said:

"Mr. Cleveland, by his message, for which I sincerely honor him, has challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination."

It is useless for us to disguise the fact that the fight is to the death, and we would be idiots to ignore it."

Of the Mills bill the New York Sun, Democratic author, said:

"The Mills tariff bill was, in its conception and purpose, a free-trade project."

The Sun also said:

"Free trade would be the natural, rational, practicable and probable result of the Mills bill, and not at a very distant date, either."

We could collate columns of testimony to the free-trade character of the December message and the Mills bill from British newspapers, but desist, reprinting, however, the following from the London Times, which was cabled to the New York World of the 7th of July. Commenting on Mr. Cleveland's letter to Tammany of about that date, the Times says:

"It would hardly be possible to put the free-trade case more clearly or more strongly, and yet, such is the force of words 'President Cleveland shrinks from the use of the term 'free trade' and in fact declares that those who taunt him with being a free-trader are deceiving the country."

It is certain that the arguments which President Cleveland urges are those which Cobden used to employ forty-five years ago, and which any English free-trader would employ now. We are very glad to see President Cleveland using them."

Of Mr. Cleveland's letter of acceptance, the Louisville Courier-Journal says:

"A TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY could not be more truly defined."

It further says:

"It knocks the bottom completely out of the protection tub, and sends a flood of daylight straight through the rotten camp. He walks straight into the den of the protection barons and crams the doctrine of a tariff for revenue only down their throats."

And the London Chronicle, one of the chief papers of England, says of it:

"It is immaterial to discuss what President Cleveland's crusade should be. It is a crusade, it is in fact, a crusade of free trade."

In view of all this, the man or paper that says the Democratic party is not a free-trade party, and attempts to deny the truth of General Harrison's terse and epigrammatic putting of the case, is either dishonest or a fool. The people will not be deceived, as the result of this campaign will demonstrate.

"IMMENSE GAINS."

No political organization ever basked so extensively on its "immense gains" as the Prohibition party. In its fourth presidential campaign (1884) its candidate received 150,946, or about one in seventy of the votes cast that year. Two years later, an off year, summing up all the odds and ends that might be counted in its favor, it claimed 298,833. This was heralded as "immense gains" and the party started out with new vigor, ciphering thus: If 150,000 becomes 300,000 in two years, it will be 600,000 in four years, and 1,200,000 in six years, and 2,400,000 in eight years, and 4,800,000 in ten years, and 9,600,000 in twelve years, and then we are there. But the year 1887 had some elections which make some modifications of these figures, yet they cry "immense gains" from sheer habit. At their national convention in this city, they fixed their figures at the 600,000 due from the above arithmetic, apportioning the vote among the States with wise discrimination. But in ten States there were elections last year, and there have been three this year, whose figures would stagger ordinary men, but our third party figures never mind it, but go on all the same crying "immense gains." For convenience we give the figures of these thirteen States for 1886 and 1887 and the estimate for 1888:

	1886.	1887.	Estimated 1888.
Iowa (1884).....	1,405	111	4,000
Massachusetts.....	7,195	4,272	15,000
Nebraska.....	8,175	6,500	16,000
New Jersey.....	19,808	12,600	30,000
Pennsylvania.....	32,438	18,471	35,000
Rhode Island.....	39,942	8,230	20,000
Massachusetts.....	8,251	10,702	12,000
Ohio.....	28,982	29,700	35,000
New York.....	36,437	40,996	75,000

It will be seen that in these States all but three greatly declined, and that the aggregate "gains" in these three large States was only 7,788, or less than one-fourth the loss in Kentucky alone, and only about one-half the loss in Pennsylvania.

There have been three elections this year. In all these this party has spent men and money, and women, too, with a lavish hand. Oregon was canvassed by St. John and Mrs. Malloy, Maine by Fisk and Miss Willard, and a hundred others, male and female.

Speaking of the Maine campaign, the candidate for Governor said, two weeks ago:

"We have raised more money than ever before. We will poll from 5,000 to 7,000, and the Voice a month ago claimed at least 10,000

for Vermont. The elections are over now, and we append the result:

	1886.	1887.	Estimated 1888.
Oregon.....	2,753	1,974	5,000
Vermont.....	1,541	1,357	25,000
Maine.....	3,873	2,006	7,000

These are the "immense gains" on which that mendacious party is making appeals to honest men for support. Unsuspecting men are led to believe that at the rate of "immense gains" the party is making, it will bury the Republican party this year, then the Democratic party in 1892, or at the furthest in 1896, so that 1900 will find it alone in its glory, and master of the situation. And some preachers repeat this story! Preachers, even as politicians, ought to tell the truth.

There has been no election in Indiana since 1886, except municipal and township elections; but these tell the same story of "immense gains" that is told in the figures above. Thus, in the Indianapolis city election the 153 of 1886 was reduced to 99; the Center township vote of 206 of 1886 was reduced to 148; the Warren township vote of 37 was reduced to 27. In Hendricks county the aggregate vote of 265 of 1886 was reduced to 95, and so on; and there has been no indication of any change in this trend, yet the orators of that party cry "immense gains."

Meanwhile, what of the Republican party, against which its batteries are trained? In Oregon both the Democratic and the Republican party made gains, the Republican party of 5,902, and the third party alone lost. They have not yet quit counting the Republican gains in Vermont and Maine, but the Prohibition party, that expected 25,000 in Vermont, is still shouting "immense gains" over its meager 1,400.

MR. STOCKSLAGER'S MAHOAGANY.

In order to protect poor settlers in Nevada and other Western deserts, Senator Stewart recently proposed an amendment to the bill for the protection of public lands, which provided that no part of the appropriation should be used in the prosecution of any person in the mining regions for cutting, for mining or domestic purposes, dwarfed or scrubby timber unfit to be sawed or hewed into lumber of commercial value.

This amendment excited the attention of Land Commissioner Stockslager, who at once wrote a letter of protest, asserting that it was offered in the interest of rich corporations, which were destroying the valuable timber of Nevada and other regions. He was particularly indignant over the destruction of mahogany trees, which he declared were actually being burned as wood or into charcoal. The Salt Lake Tribune jeers at Mr. Stockslager for his ignorance, and the ease with which he has been gulled into the belief that the scrubby mountain mahogany of the far West is the mahogany of commerce, which grows only in the tropics. The Tribune wants to have a mountain mahogany tree dug up and sent to the superintending Commissioner as an object lesson, and says:

"He would see at a glance how infamously his spies have been imposing upon him and how utterly contemptible and mean are the prosecutions which Sparks set on foot, and which he is continuing. It is a mighty pity that all those sensitive gentlemen, whose fathers cut and burned the beautiful timber of the East, cannot be forced to camp for a single month in Nevada, and be compelled to provide the fuel for their cook from the native timber of the State. It is simply a shame for those educated asses—and their educations are not sufficient to excite any envy—to sit there in Washington and, with-out the slightest knowledge of what they are really doing, set forces in action which can have but two results. One is to supply fees to broken-down tramps, who want to make a living out of the party which they disgrace; the other is to harass, annoy and put to cruel expense the men who are building signal stations to civilization on the desert. If the men of the West can find one act of the party in power, performed since the inauguration of President Cleveland, that has not been apparently controlled by utter ignorance, or a disposition to harass and oppress them, we should be glad to see the exception pointed out."

THE MAINE AVALANCHE.

The assertions of the Democratic press that their party had made no fight in Maine are glaring falsehoods. The truth is that the managers strained every nerve to reduce the Republican majority. Money was spent freely, their best speakers were sent there, and the fight was made on national and not local issues. They also counted largely on the federal patronage, which they control for the first time in many years, and to which they have heretofore been accustomed to ascribe the Republican victories. So sure were the leaders that their tremendous efforts must show great results that they indulged in sanguine anticipations, some even expressing a belief that the Democracy would carry the State. Others, less hopeful, were sure that the Republican majority would be cut down to 10,000. The outcome is a terrible disappointment. Now that the returns are still coming in, and making the Republican majority larger, Messrs. Brice & Co. can hardly be expected to understand what hurt them, but after a few days they can take time for calm reflection and cast their eyes upon the wool-growers, the lumbermen, the lime-workers, the potato-raisers, the fishers, and the thousands of others whose interests were imperiled by the Democratic free-trade and English policy. It was not personal magnetism this year. It was principles rather than men, and the chiefest was the principle of self-preservation. The same influences that brought the victories in Vermont and Maine are at work in other States, and the result in November will be a triumph of the American, which is also the Republican, idea—that of protection to home industries and the prosperity of all citizens.

GEN. J. R. CHALMERS, of Mississippi, delivered a speech at Little Rock, Ark., a few days ago, in which he made some strong points in favor of protection. Referring to cotton, in which many of his hearers were personally interested, he showed that the cotton crop of the country brought an average of \$55,000,000 a year more for the six years ending in 1880 than for the six years ending in 1860, and yet, while the product was steadily increasing, the price was not lowered. This could only come from an increased demand for cotton, and this, in turn, came from the growth of home manufactures. Statistics show that England took less cotton from us in 1880 than she did in 1860, and that the

whole foreign demand for our cotton increased less than 3 per cent. in twenty years, while our production of cotton increased 22 per cent. The speaker continued:

"Now, let us see what kept up the price while production was so largely increased. Our home consumption was, in 1860, 984,628 bales; in 1880, 1,795,334 bales, an increase of 80 per cent. And during the same period all cotton bales which the Southern farmers could grow were reduced in price 28 per cent. These so-called protection robbers, by their sharp competition, compelled the foreigner to pay 2 per cent. more for cotton in 1880 than he paid in 1860, before protection began, and at the same time furnished the planter with cotton goods at 28 per cent. less cost."

It is such facts and figures as these that are rousing the American people to the criminal folly involved in the proposition to substitute free trade for protection.

We suppose no candidate for so high an office ever penned a more humiliating recantation than that Mr. Harrison writes in this letter concerning Chinese immigration. In his senatorial career he was distinguished for nothing except his advocacy of Chinese immigration.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

The Courier-Journal knows this to be absolutely false. Not a word or a vote of Gen. Harrison's can be quoted in favor of Chinese immigration. While a member of the Senate, on May 19, 1886, he wrote to Mr. Martin Biorn, a Knight of Labor in Frankfurt, this State, which letter the Journal published yesterday, in which he said:

"I agree with you that they are not a class of immigrants that are desirable. * * * The present law prohibits the coming in of any more Chinese, and I have been in hopes that those who came under the previous treaty would be returned to their native land to stay."

And on the 26th of May he again wrote Mr. Biorn, saying:

"While I am writing we are considering in the Senate a bill to amend and make more stringent the present law. I will send you a copy of it. It will make the coming in of Chinese laborers, in violation of law, more difficult."

This is cumulative and unexpected evidence of General Harrison's mind touching the Chinese; but it is valuable and conclusive. What the Courier-Journal can expect to accomplish by downright misrepresentation and lying we cannot conceive. Mr. Watterson had better read the fearful Gorman's remarks in the Senate a few days ago.

THE New York Graphic, the national subsidized Democratic organ, says about the Maine election:

"The Maine Republicans ought to carry the State to-day by 20,000 majority. For six years past this has been about the average figure by which they have beaten the Democracy. * * * Four years ago the Maine Republicans carried the gubernatorial election for [his] [Blaine's] nominee in September of that year by a majority of over 20,000."

The Graphic should stop telling untruths, even if Mr. Brice does pay it for campaign work. In 1882 the Republican plurality was 8,872. In 1884, with Mr. Blaine as the Presidential candidate, it rose to 19,855. In 1886 it was 12,649. The average for the last six years has been 13,802, instead of 20,000. The Democrats had better drop Maine. They gnaw a file.

GENERAL GROSVENOR, of Ohio, who has taken part in five campaigns in Maine, including the last, says this one surpassed all others in hard fighting on both sides. The Democrats, he thinks, had the best organization, as they certainly did the most money, and the active, untiring aid of an army of office-holders. "They fought with a desperation," says General Grosvenor, "such as I never witnessed before. The excitement in the State became intense. It was one continuous torchlight procession from Kittery to Quoddyhead." The result far exceeds the most sanguine hopes of the Republicans, and is a crushing disappointment to the Democratic managers.

The total duties remitted by the Mills bill according to the official estimate of the committee, appended to their report, is \$49,456,240.75. The schedules affected by the bill produced a revenue, last year, amounting to \$179,741,330.71. These are the Democratic figures, and they prove that the Mills bill makes a reduction of 27 per cent. In view of the committee's own official statement, what becomes of the stereotyped and dishonest cry that the Mills bill only makes a reduction of 5, 6 or 7 per cent.? Out of the committee's own report, the statement made so glibly and repeatedly is proven false.

HON. CHARLES H. KNIGHT, of Brazil, one of the foremost Democrats of Clay county, has declared for Harrison and Morton and protection. A large number of the leading citizens of that county have addressed him a note, requesting him to make a public address at the wigwag on Thursday evening, Sept. 20. Mr. Knight responded, accepting the invitation, in a letter in which he denounces the free-trade policy of the administration. Mr. Knight's accession to the ranks of protection is of the utmost value. He is a man of character, prominence and large influence.

THE New York Times thinks General Harrison's letter lacks altogether the "power of luminous statement which characterizes President Cleveland." As Mr. Cleveland's luminosity in his letter of acceptance leads one Democratic organ to remark that a tariff for revenue only could not be more tersely stated, and another to declare that it is the very essence of protection, the Times's observation seems to be very just. General Harrison certainly does seem to lack the "luminous" faculty of expressing two meanings in one utterance.

THE Cincinnati Enquirer has finally got tired of lying about Maine, by claiming a Democratic victory. Yesterday its Portland special said:

"There are but few redeeming features in to-night's resume of the situation. Every report adds to the majorities. Manley says tonight, with much show of truthfulness, that every county has gone Republican. The Senate is unanimously Republican, and the House four-fifths so. The Republican plurality in the State is fully 20,000. It is the largest the party has ever had, and so is Read's."

No, esteemed but excited Democratic contemporary, the members of the G. A. R. are not partisans; they are patriots, and there is nothing in their constitution and by-laws to forbid it. It is the misfortune of the Demo-

cratic Congressmen and not the fault of the veterans, that the former are in the way of the Grand Army road-roller when it starts in pursuit of the opponents of pension legislation.

THE Richmond Telegram prints an interview with General Hovey, in which he says: "Just so long as Grover Cleveland is in the White House and the lower house in Congress controlled by a solid South and a few Democrats, the soldier will have no benefit from the present administration. The hopes of the soldier, his interests, rest with the Republican party. The House is dominated by the Southern brigadiers, and they will, of course, have no legislation that will in any way benefit the men who fought them. No, indeed, the soldier can look for nothing good from this Democratic administration."